

'85/3

bulletin

Krishnamurti Foundation India

INDIA	Krishnamurti Foundation India 'Vasanta Vihar', 64-65, Greenways Road, Madras-600 028.
ENGLAND	Krishnamurti Foundation Trust Ltd., 24 Southend Road, Beckenham, Kent BR3 1SD, England.
U.S.A.	Krishnamurti Foundation of America, P.O. Box 216, Ojai, California 93023, U.S.A.
PUERTO RICO (Spanish America)	Fundacion Krishnamurti Hispanoamericana. P.O. Box 1782, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00919-1782 U.S.A.
CANADA	Krishnamurti Educational Centre of Canada, 538 Swanwick Road, R.R. No. 1, Victoria, B.C. V8X 3W9. Associated Committees.
AUSTRALIA	Mrs. Mavis Bennett, Krishnamurti Books, P.O. Box 655, Surfers Paradise, Queensland 4217.
BELGIUM	Comte and Comtesse Hugues van der Straten Ponthoz, Mr. R. Linssen, Domaine du Bercuit, 211, 5980, Grez-Doiceau Dutch Speaking Committee, p/a: Catoor Monica, Mortierstr II; Poesele-Nevele, 9850.
BRAZIL	Instituicao Cultural Krishnamurti, Avenida Presidente Vargas 418-Sala 1.109, Caixa Postal 1827-ZC-00, Rio de Janeiro Estado Do Rio de Janeiro.
DENMARK	Krishnamurti Komiteen, Skodsborgvej 339, 2850 Naerum.
FINLAND	Krishnamurti-Kirjat, Eerikinkatu, 26-A 9, 00100 Helsinki 10.
FRANCE	Association Culturelle Krishnamurti, 73, Rue Fondary, Paris 15C. Mlle Pascaline Mallet, President.
GERMANY and AUSTRIA	Mrs. I. Von Massenbach, Ganghoferstr 7, D-8031 Gernlinden, Mr. Manfred Schneider, D-6072 Dreieich-Gotzenhain, Albert-Schweitzer-Strasse 1.
GREECE	Dr. I. Demetriades-Bachas, 26, 40 Ekklosion Str. Nea Smyrni, Athens.
ICELAND	Mr. S. Halldorsson, Bakkastig 1, Reykjavik.
INDONESIA	Mr. M. Dalidd, 14 Djalan Singkep, Malang.
ISRAEL	Mr. Avraham Jacoby, Aneveim Street, No. 7, Shicoon-Mizrhr, Rishon-le-Zion, Israel.
ITALY	Dott. Ing. Giovanni Turchi, Via Garofalo 19, 20133 Milano.
NETHERLANDS	Stichting Krishnamurti Nederland, Secretary : Lage Duin 19, 2121 CC Bennebroek, Bookorders, Bulletin: Weikamperweg 93, 7351 TG Hoenderloo.
NEW ZEALAND	Mr. Ray Falla, 9, Ulm Place, Christchurch 6.
NORWAY	Krishnamurti Biblioteket, Post Box 1703, Vika, Oslo 1. Norway.
PORTUGAL	Nucleo Cultural Krishnamurti, Av. Leonor Fernandes 36, 7000 Evora.
SOUTH AFRICA	Krishnamurti Learning Centre of Southern Africa, 113. Ninth Avenue, Durban.
SPAIN	Krishnamurti Informatcion, Calle Canuda 45-47 Barcelona 2.
SWEDEN	Krishnamurti Center, C/o. Englund, Storskogsvagen 45 14400, Ronninge.
SWITZERLAND	Krishnamurti Freunde der Schweiz (German and Italian speaking) Mr. Franz Haller, Bachstrasse 18, 5303 Wurenlingen Miss Gisele Balleys (for the Suisse Romande), Rue Encyclopedie 6 bis, 1202 Geneva.
SRILANKA	Krishnamurti Centre, Sri Lanka, Inc. 23/3, Mirihana Road, Nugegoda.

FROM THE EDITOR

On the 21st of July this year it was announced in the tent at the Saanen Gatherings that it was the last talk that Krishnaji would be giving there; that from next year onwards, the only talks in Europe will be held at Brockwood Park, between July 20th and August 8th.

We are happy to announce the publication of "Letters to the Schools" Volume II. Krishnaji points out — "These letters are not meant to be read casually when you have a little time from other things, nor are they to be treated as entertainment. These letters are written seriously and if you care to read them, read them with intent to study what is said as you would study a flower by looking at the flower very carefully — its petals, its stem, its colours, its fragrance and its beauty. These letters should be studied in the same manner, not read one morning and forgotten the rest of the day. One must give time to it, play with it, question it, enquire into it without acceptance; live with it for some time; digest it so that it is yours and not the writer's"

This booklet will be released at the time of the talks in India during the coming winter.

We are also bringing out a pamphlet containing the talk on "Creativity in Science" which Krishnaji gave to the scientists at the National Laboratory Research Center at Los Alamos, New Mexico, U.S.A. on March 20th 1984.

At Uttar Kashi

Far from the din and bustle of the cities, the river Bhagirathi flows, muddy and carefree, watched indulgently by the ancient snow-capped Himalayas. In a quiet spot on its banks near Uttarkashi, the Krishnamurti Foundation has now 5 acres of land — 2 1/2 acres on either side.

The Foundation intends this land to become a place of retreat for which it is ideally suited. It is proposed to build 5 or 6 cottages and

a hall to accommodate at least 50 people. It would be used to hold meetings, to have audio and video tapes of Krishnaji's talks shown to people, and to conduct talks and dialogues from time to time. It will also contain a library of Krishnaji's books.

While the Krishnamurti schools in India will hold camps and meetings for teachers and students here, this place is also for serious people to come and live for short durations, to study the teachings of Krishnaji and to learn about themselves, the nature and structure of consciousness, and the way of mutation and intelligence. At present, the Uttarkashi Committee of the KFI has rented a house with five rooms, a dining hall, kitchen etc., well furnished and equipped, with accent on simplicity.

The first camp was held last year with 12 people living there for 5 days and discussing among themselves the relevance of Krishnaji's teachings to daily life.

Surrounded by the austere grandeur of the Himalayan ranges, one could listen to the whispering of the waters of the Bhagirathi as it wended its way down to the plains below.

The Foundation requires financial assistance, munificent donations, from interested and serious minded people, to develop this place by building cottages, planting trees, landscaping the place and so on. Those who would like to know more about this place and wish to avail of the opportunity to visit and stay there may please write to Shri R.R. Upasani, Secretary Rajghat Executive Committee, Rajghat Fort, Varanasi — 221 001, or to the Secretary, Krishnamurti Foundation India, 'Vasant Vihar' 64 Greenways Road, Madras — 600 028.

In this issue we have included an article titled 'Guide on the Path to Peace' by Michael Kernan in Washington Post dated, April 18, 1985. It contains a biographical sketch of Krishnaji as well as extracts from a talk given by him on April 12, 1985, at Washington D.C. This is followed by a short account of Krishnaji's life and sayings by Alan Parachini in Los Angeles Times Sunday, May 19, 1985. In the last few pages are some questions and answers at the Ojai meetings in May this year.

GUIDE ON THE PATH TO PEACE

The Washington Post Thursday, April 18, 1985.

By Michael Kernan

"War is not in Beirut. It is in our hearts and minds."

"Can the human brain, which has been conditioned to wars for millennia on millennia, can that human brain radically change? That is the question."

Jiddu Krishnamurti, the great Indian teacher and philosopher, will make his first Washington appearance this weekend. He will speak Saturday at 2.30 p.m. and Sunday at 11 a.m. at the Kennedy Center. His subject is, "Do We Really want Peace?"

He was asked in an interview : What if a listener takes his suggestions to heart and does indeed change? What can one person do? What use will that be in Washington, this citadel of power and fear?

"I was speaking the other day at the United Nations," he replied, "and somebody asked the same question. What if one person changed? That is a wrong question. Change ... and see what happens."

On May 22 Krishnamurti will be 90 years old. He flew to Washington this week from Ojai, Calif, where he lives part of the year at the home of a disciple, Mary Zimbalist, widow of film producer Sam Zimbalist. He travels throughout the year from America

to Europe to India, lecturing and listening. This afternoon he is to be the guest of Sen. Claiborne Pell (D.R.I.) at a tea for members of Congress.

The Washington talks were arranged by Milton Friedman, a White House speech writer and special assistant to President Ford and later a Reagan speech writer until he resigned from the political world. It was the Vietnam war, he said, that brought him to Krishnamurti. "When I saw where the White House was going, I realized the only response was prayer and meditation. From the love of power, to the power of love, I guess."

Krishnamurti is a small man, condensed by the years. He has narrow hands with long, thin fingers. His body seems fragile under the slacks and soft shirt and plastic sandals. His friends call him "K". He sits on a hard chair, always a hard chair, and his eyes look into you without challenging.

"I have been saying this for 60 years: We have had thousands of wars through the years, and we remain barbarians, barbarous, we are cruel to each other, we try to hurt each other physically and psychologically. So the problem is whether the world realizes what it is, whether humans realize what they are. It is a crisis in our consciousness. We cannot allow it to go on.

"Is it possible for human beings, always talking of peace and never having it, with our technology and wars, can we do anything radically to break from this pattern completely? I think it is possible if we had a mind to."

Understand, he is not a guru. He can't bear gurus. "It is terrible what gurus have done in America," he says. "People want to be helped. Look, this idea of being helped, asking for help, is a destructive way of living. We make ourselves helpless by asking for help, handing yourself over to someone else."

In "The Network of Thought," one of his more than 30 books of dialogues and lectures, he writes of "the terrible religious sectarian divisions, one guru opposed to another idiotic guru, the vanity behind all that, the power, the position, the wealth of these gurus, it is appalling."

He uses no incense, no sitars, no drama. He rejects not only media gurus and popcults but all formal religions, all established institutions, all those who take it upon themselves to instruct others how to live.

“Whether it’s the Buddha, Christ, the pope or Mr. Reagan telling me what to do. . . . I won’t. This means we have to be extraordinarily capable of standing alone. And nobody wants to do that.”

Even God, he says, is an illusion, invented by thought. He writes, “Thought has created God (the speaker is not an atheist); thought has created ideologies, thought has created wars, murdered, in the name of God, millions of people. God was invented by man, it’s so obvious, so clear. He is our image projected, what we want to be, wiser, more powerful and so on. . . .”

“Unless one is completely free from belief, from any form of emotional attachment, then one is a slave. . . . When you end attachment completely, then love is.”

“To learn about, to understand, oneself, all authority must be set aside. Obviously, authority is part of oneself; one is the priest, the disciple, the teacher, one is the experience and one is the ultimate — if one knows how to understand. There is nothing to be learnt from anybody, including the speaker; especially one must not be influenced by the speaker.”

From the age of 10, Krishnamurti has been more or less a public figure. He has never enjoyed it. Adopted as a teen-ager by Annie Besant, president of the Theosophical Society, the young Brahman was proclaimed as the World Teacher, an incarnation of the Christ or Buddha, was educated privately in England and France and eventually became the leader of an international order with thousands of members.

But in 1929 he dissolved the organization, the World Order of the Star, returned the money and property, for he saw the whole apparatus as merely another set of leaders and followers, another division of the human race, another separating of people.

“Truth is a pathless land,” he said.

Celebrities took him up from time to time, each seeking something from him. John Barrymore wanted him to play the Buddha in a film, but he refused. Greta Garbo came to listen and then walked away from her movie career, whether under his influence it is not clear. The Beatles met him in India but preferred another mentor. Bertrand Russell, George Bernard Shaw and Aldous Huxley corresponded with him. Einstein, who said that humanity needed to reach a higher

level of awareness to solve the problem of nuclear war, was interested in his ideas.

Today the nonprofit Krishnamurti Foundation sponsors schools in India and England as well as the Oak Grove School at Ojai, educating children from preschool through high school in academic subjects and an attitude to life.

He is thoroughly vegetarian, though he has been known to eat an omelette. He has never tasted meat. Doesn't smoke or drink or take drugs, he admits with a laugh. Every morning he does yoga exercises. He likes to walk.

"We drove on the George Washington Parkway and saw the marvelous trees in Virginia. It's so beautiful, the leaves and spring flowers. What does that convey to the people in America, the people who go in and out, in and out, in their fast cars? Do they look at all this?"

"When you use the word beauty, does it imply mere sensation, pleasure? A mere response of the senses? If that was it, you could just take a drug. What is beauty, then, if it is not mere sensation?"

He talks of this absorption of the senses, of how a child can be completely absorbed by a new toy, and of the breathtaking sight of mountains, the sky, the panorama of a great valley. "The sight absorbs you, you feel, ah, how marvellous. The beauty of it for a moment drives out the self.

"When you can be free of the self — without any absorption, that is real beauty — when the self is not."

English theoretical physicist David Bohm was attracted to Krishnamurti's insights into the inseparability of the observer and the observed, a basic notion in quantum theory.

"When I first met him on one of his visits to London," Bohm writes, "I was struck by the great ease of communication with him, which was made possible by the intense energy with which he listened and by the freedom from self-protective reservations and barriers with which he responded to what I had to say."

His dialogues with the philosopher, in England and America in 1980, have been published as "The Ending of Time," and Bohm has attempted to sum up what he believes to be Krishnamurti's major discovery:

“What he was seriously proposing is that all this disorder, which is the root cause of such widespread sorrow and misery, and which prevents human beings from properly working together, has its root in the fact that we are ignorant of the general nature of our own processes of thought. Or to put it differently, it may be said that we do not see what is actually happening when we are engaged in the activity of thinking.”

Perceiving thought as a material process, a product of a physical organ, the brain, and therefore limited, Krishnamurti would have us be aware of the structure and function of thought, not just of its content. This awareness he calls meditation, by which he means something quite different from conventional meditation methods.

“That is to say,” Bohm continues, “one gives close attention to all that is happening in conjunction with the actual activity of thought, which is the underlying source of the general disorder. One does this without choice, without criticism, without acceptance or rejection of what is going on. And all of this takes place along with reflections on the meaning of what one is learning about the activity of thought.”

It seems to come down to this. “Choiceless awareness,” the awareness from moment to moment of exactly what is going on within oneself, not trying to change or direct it but merely observing — that is how a person can change without effort. As Krishnamurti says, “Know yourself, that’s the basis. A very simple idea.”

“Your consciousness is the consciousness of all humanity because you suffer, you are anxious, you are lonely, insecure, confused, exactly like others, though they live 10,000 miles away. The realization of it, the feeling of it — the feeling in your guts — is totally different from the mere verbal acceptance. When you realize that you are the rest of mankind, it brings a tremendous energy, you have broken through the narrow groove of individuality, the narrow circle of me and you, we and they.

“Please do not accept what the speaker is saying; if you do it will have no meaning. . . .”

He is worried about America, which he first visited in 1922. He speaks of the vastly increased violence, the guns and drugs, the ill treatment of children. Over and over, he asks the people he meets, “What is going to happen? Doesn’t anyone talk about all this. . . . Why doesn’t the new generation act?”

He says, "I'm not so sure people want peace. They are perpetually in conflict, with themselves, their neighbors, their wives and husbands. There is so much pride. Nationalism, tribalism."

He asks, "Are we individuals? Every religion emphasizes the individual soul, all these separate souls reaching toward God, whatever God means."

America's TV evangelists, notably Jerry Falwell, he regards with amusement and some astonishment. "The way they talk of God," he says, getting the word "Gaaahd" just right. "Selling God. God looks after me. He's my protector. Me. It's appalling."

We may be different in many ways, he points out, dark, light, Swiss, Japanese, Hindu, Christian, rich, poor, man, woman, but these differences he finds superficial, for psychologically we all have the same reactions, the same feelings.

"We are the entire humanity, each one of us. Human beings go through every type of depression and anxiety, we share all that, each one shares the entire humanity. It's not just another idea, it's a fact. But our conditioning is so strong, and the whole society is based on it, that people think the individual is everything, that you must become someone."

Recently the philosopher has been thinking about the computer and the degree to which it has entered our business life, our schools, our games, even the supermarkets. He worries that the human brain will atrophy from sheer lack of exercise, just as the muscles of upcoming American generations appear to be measurably softer.

"The computer experts aren't concerned with this," he says, "but it's serious. Sports are on the increase, hours and hours of watching TV, the brain isn't exercised, it turns to entertainment, sports, sensation. Is the government concerned? The newspapers? Life is losing its meaning."

From a book: "The speaker has nothing to teach you. Please realize this. The speaker is merely acting as a mirror in which you can see yourself. Then when you can see yourself clearly you can discard the mirror; it has no more importance, you can break it up."

To an interviewer: "Are there any people in this town who don't belong to a group? Is there anyone concerned with all of America, and what is going to happen to this country? I'm not sure, sir. I don't think there is in India either, someone concerned with all of humanity. Isn't it a tragedy, sir?"

WASHINGTON D.C. TALK 12th APRIL 1985.

J. Krishnamurti

We were talking about fear and the ending of fear yesterday. Also about the responsibility of each one of us facing what is happening in the world, the appalling, frightening mess we are in. And for that we are all responsible, individually, collectively, nationally, religiously. After all this, the wars we have made after millennia upon millennia, the long evolution, we have still remained barbarians; hurting each other, killing each other, destroying each other. One had freedom to do exactly what one liked and that has created havoc in the world. Freedom is not to do what one likes but rather to be free of all the travails of life, from the problems, from our anxieties, from our psychological wounds, from all the conflicts that we have put up with for millennia.

This morning we have to cover a great deal of ground. We are together going to investigate our lives, our daily lives; that is, to understand oneself, what one is actually, not theoretically, not according to some philosopher or some psychiatrist and so on. You can put aside all that and look at yourself, actually what you are and not be depressed or elated but to observe, which is to understand the whole psychological structure of your being, of your existence. And we talked about it yesterday, one of the things that human beings go through all their life is a form of fear and that time and thought are the root of fear. Time is not only the past and the present and the future but in the present all time is contained, because what we are now we will be tomorrow unless there is a great fundamental mutation in the very psyche itself, in the very brain cells themselves.

If one may point out, the speaker and you are taking a journey together, a long complicated journey and to take that journey one mustn't be attached to any particular form of belief. It's like climbing the Everest or some of the great marvellous mountains of the world; one has to leave a great deal behind, not carry all your burdens up the steep hills.

We ought also to talk over together why human beings have always pursued pleasure as opposed to fear. We never investigate what is pleasure, why we want everlasting pleasure in different ways: Sexual, sensory, intellectual, the pleasure of possessions, the pleasure of acquiring great skill, the pleasure that one derives from having a great deal of information, knowledge and the ultimate gratification is what we call god. We are not doing any kind of propaganda or trying to convince you of anything but you are going to face the truth of things, not live in delusions. And it is very difficult to observe without delusions. If you are deluding yourself, not facing actualities then it becomes impossible to look at oneself as one is. But we like delusions, illusions, every form of deception because we are frightened to look at ourselves. To look at yourself very clearly, accurately, precisely, is only possible in a mirror of relationship. That is the only mirror that we have. When you look at yourself when you are combing your hair or shaving or whatever you are doing to your face, the mirror reflects exactly what you are, what your face is, and you look. And psychologically, is there such a mirror in which you can see exactly, precisely, actually what you are?

There is such a mirror, which is, one's relationship, however intimate it be. In that relationship you see what you are, if you allow yourself to see what you are. Man has pursued pleasure endlessly in the name of god, peace, and in the name of ideology and pleasure of power, having power over others. Have you noticed, power is an ugly thing, when one dominates another in any form, the wife dominating the husband, or the husband dominating the woman? Power is one of the evil things of life.

Pleasure is the other side of the coin of fear. When one understands deeply, profoundly, seriously, the nature of fear, then one also has to understand pleasure. That is, delight, seeing something beautiful, seeing the sunset or the morning light of the dawn, the marvellous colours, reflection of the sun in the waters; that is a delight, but we make that as a memory and cultivate that

memory as pleasure. Also, as we said, just look at it, not do something about it.

I don't know if you have gone into the question of action. What is action? We are all so active from morning till night, not only physically but psychologically. The brain is everlastingly chattering, going from one thing to another, endlessly during the day and during the night, you have dreams. The brain is never at rest, it is perpetually in motion. What is action? It is the doing. Is the very word doing, the present? It is not 'having done' or 'will do'; action means the doing now correctly, accurately, completely. The action is whole, complete, not partial. When action is based on some ideology, it is not action, is it? It is conformity to a certain pattern which you have established and therefore it is incomplete action or according to some memory, some conclusion. If you act according to some ideology or pattern or conclusion, it is still incomplete. There is a contradiction always. So one has to enquire into this very complex problem of action.

Is action related to disorder? We live in disorder, our life is disorderly, confused, contradictory, saying one thing, doing another, thinking one thing and doing just the opposite in our action. So what is order and disorder? Perhaps you have not thought about all these matters. So let us think together about all this. Let us be aware together of this question of what is order and what is disorder and what is the relationship of action to order and disorder.

The very word 'to act' means the present, acting. What is the relationship between disorder and order? What is disorder? Look at the world, if you would. The world is in disorder. There is always the threat of war and all the terrible things that are happening in Russia, the poverty in all the countries, the division between the rich and the terribly poor, one political group against another political group and so on. This is actuality, not an invention or an illusion, and we have created this disorder. Our living is disorder. And we are trying to bring about order with social reforms and so on. Without understanding and bringing about the end of disorder, we try to find order, like a confused mind trying to find clarity.

A confused mind can never find clarity. Can there be an end to disorder in our daily lives, not in heaven or in any other place? Can there be order in our daily life? When there is the end of disorder there is naturally order. That order is living, not according to a certain pattern. So we are investigating, looking, at ourselves and are

learning about ourselves. Learning is different from acquiring knowledge. Learning is an infinite process, a limitless process whereas knowledge is always limited. Learning implies not only observing visually, optically, but also observing without any distortion, hearing things exactly what the other fellow is saying without any distortion. Learning is not accumulative because you are moving. So, when we are learning what is disorder in ourselves, then order comes about very naturally, easily, unexpectedly. Where there is order, order is virtue. There is no other virtue except complete order, i.e. complete morality, not some imposed or dictated morality.

We ought also to talk over together this whole question of sorrow. Man and woman, children, throughout the world, whether they are behind the Iron Curtain, whether they live in South Asia or India or Europe or here, every human being, rich or poor, intellectual or just ordinary laymen like us, we all go through every form of suffering. Have you ever looked at people that had cried through centuries, through thousands of wars, the husband, the wife, the children, this immense sorrow in the world? Not that there is not also pleasure, joy and so on but in the ending of sorrow we'll perhaps find something much greater. So we must go into this complex question of sorrow. And whether it can ever end or man is doomed forever to suffer, not only physically which depends how orderly a life one leads, whether your body has been destroyed by drug or tobacco, nicotine or alcohol and all that. And psychologically, inwardly, we have suffered enormously, perhaps not said a word about it or crying your heart out. During all this long evolution of man, from the beginning of time till now, every human being on this earth has suffered.

Suffering is not merely the loss of someone you think you like or love but also the suffering of the very poor, the illiterate. If you go to India and other parts of the world, you see people walking miles and miles to go to a school, little girls and little boys; they will never be rich, never ride a car, probably never have a hot bath, where one sari or dress or whatever they wear is all that they have. And that is sorrow, not for the man who goes by in a car but the man in the car is in sorrow if he is at all sensitive, aware. And there is the sorrow of ignorance, not the ignorance of writing, reading literature and all the rest of it but the sorrow of a man who does not know himself. There are multiple ways of sorrow and we are asking, can the sorrow end with each one? There is sorrow in oneself and there is the sorrow of the world — thousands of wars, people

maimed, hurt, appalling cruelty — not a particular form of cruelty of which we are talking a great deal and we are rebelling against that particular form. But you never ask, is there an end to cruelty. Every nation on earth has committed cruelty and it is appalling and we are still perpetuating that cruelty. And cruelty breeds enormous sorrow.

Seeing all this, not from a book, not from a traveller, not from a tourist — the tourists go abroad just to amuse themselves, having a good time, a holiday — if you are travelling as a human being, just yourself, being aware, sensitive to all this, sorrow is a terrible thing and you have to ask can sorrow end. Please ask yourself that question. The speaker is not stimulating you to feel sorrow, the speaker is not telling you what sorrow, is, but it is there right in front of us, right inside you. Nobody need to point out if you keep your eyes open, if you are sensitive, aware of what is happening in this monstrous world. So please ask yourself this question whether sorrow can ever end. Because, like hatred, when there is sorrow, there is no love. When you are suffering, concerned, with your own suffering, how can there be love?

So what is sorrow? Not only the physical pain, the enduring pain, the person who is paralysed, maimed or diseased but also the sorrow of losing someone, the death of someone. Is sorrow self-pity? Please investigate. We are not saying it is or it is not. We are asking, is sorrow brought about by self-pity. It is one of the factors. Is sorrow brought about by loneliness, feeling desperately lonely, the feeling of being isolated and having in that loneliness no relationship with anything? Is sorrow merely an intellectual affair, to be rationalised, explained away or to live with it without any desire for comfort? To live with sorrow, not escape from it, not rationalise it, not find some elusive or exclusive comfort — religious or some illusory romantic escapes — but to live with something, that has tremendous significance. Sorrow is not only a physical shock when one loses one's son or wife or husband. It is a tremendous biological shock, it is almost paralysing. Don't you know all this? Can one look at sorrow as it actually is and remain with it, hold it and not move away from it?

Sorrow is not different from the one who suffers. The person who suffers wants to run away, escape, do all kinds of things, but look at it as you would look at a child, a beautiful child, to hold it, never escape from it, then you will see for yourself, if you really do it deeply that there is an end to sorrow. When there is an end to sorrow,

there is passion, not lust, not sensory stimulation but passion. But very few have this passion, because we are full with our own grief, pains, with our self-pity, vanity and all the rest of it.

We have a great deal of energy. Look at what is happening in the world: Tremendous energy to invent new things, gadgets, new ways of killing others. To go to the moon needs tremendous energy. Love is something that cannot be invited or cultivated. It comes about naturally, easily, when the other things are not. And in learning about oneself, one comes upon this. Where there is love there is compassion. And compassion has its own intelligence. That is the supreme form of intelligence, not the intelligence of thought, the intelligence of cunning deception and all the rest of it. It is only when there is complete love and compassion that there is the excellence of intelligence which is not mechanical.

We also ought to talk about death. What is the meaning of that word — dying, the ending? Not only the ending of all that has happened but what happens after death? Does one carry memories of one's own life? The whole Asiatic world believes in reincarnation. That is, I die, I have led a miserable life, perhaps I did a little good here and there and next life I will be better, I will do more good. It is based on reward and punishment, like everything else in life. I will do good this life and I will be better next life. It is based on the word "Karma". The word 'Karma' in Sanskrit means action. So there is this belief that when one has led this life, next life you have better chance depending on what kind of life you have led now — reward and punishment. In Christianity there is this whole sense of resurrection and so on. So we can put aside all that, not cling to one thing or the other. Then what is death, what does it mean to die — not only biologically, physically, but also to one's tendencies, idiosyncracies, the things one has gathered whether it be money, knowledge, friendship; all that you have acquired. When death comes, it says 'sorry, you can't take anything with you'. So what does it mean to die?

What is death? How do you enquire into it? I am living, I am taking that as an example; I go along every day, routine, happy, unhappy, the whole business of it and death comes through accident, through disease, through old age, senility. What is senility? Is it only for the old? Is it not senility when you are just repeating and repeating, when you act mechanically, thoughtlessly? Is that also not a form of senility? So death comes. We are frightened of it. We never see the greatness of it. It is an extraordinary thing like

a baby being born, a new being has come into being; that is an extraordinary event and that child grows and becomes whatever you have all become and that dies. Death is also something extraordinary. It must be. You won't see its greatness and depth of it if you are frightened. So what is death? I want to find out what it is to die while I am living. I am not senile, I have all my wits about me. I am capable of thinking very clearly; perhaps occasionally go off the beam, but I am active, clear, all the rest of it. So I am asking myself, I am only observing, what is death? Death means, surely, the ending of everything, ending of my relationship, ending of all the things that I have put together in my life; all the knowledge, all the experience, the meaningless life I have led, or trying to find out the meaning intellectually in life. I have lived that way, not personally, but I am taking that as an example. And death comes and says that is the end. But I am frightened, I cannot say I have got so much — not only furniture or picture. When I identify myself with the furniture or the picture or the bank account, I am the bank account, I am the picture, and the furniture. When you identify yourself with something so completely, you are that. Perhaps you don't like all that but please kindly listen.

So I have established roots, I have established great many things and death comes and makes a clean sweep of all that. So I ask myself is it possible to live with death all the time, not at the end of 90 years or 100 years or at the end of one's life but can I with all my energy, vitality, live with death all the time? Not commit suicide, that's too silly but live with death which means ending every day everything I have collected. I don't know if you have gone into the question of what is continuity and what is ending. That which continues can never renew itself, reborn, be clear. That which is continuous can revive itself like you are doing in this country — the revival of religions. As we said, the word revival means that which has withered, died and we revive, which is what is happening in this country. They are shouting about it. Organised religions with their groups are tremendously rich people, with great property. There is a temple in the South of India; every third day they get one million dollars. You understand? God is very profitable. It is not cynicism. It is an actuality. We are facing actuality and cannot be cynical. We cannot be either optimistic or pessimistic. We have to look at all these things. So can I live with death — everything that I have done, collected, pain, sorrow — can all that end? Ending is more important

than continuity. Ending means begin again, something new. If you really continue, it is the same pattern repeated in a different mould.

Have you noticed a strange thing? We have made a great deal of mess in the world, tremendous mess, and we organise to clear up that mess politically, religiously, socially, economically; and when that organisation or institution does not work, we invent another organisation and there is never a clearing up of that mess. But we bring about new organisations, new institutions and this is called progress. This is what we are doing, creating thousands of institutions. The other day we talked at the United Nations — war is going on, they have never stopped it but they are reorganising it. You are also doing exactly the same thing in this country. We never clear up the mess and we depend upon organisations to clear that up, and new leaders, new gurus, new faces and all that rubbish that is going on. So can I live with death? That means freedom, total, holistic freedom. Therefore in that freedom there is compassion and that intelligence which is not an end, which is immense.

Also we ought to talk over together what is religion. Man has always sought something beyond all this — pain, anxiety, sorrow. Is there something that is sacred, eternal, that is beyond all the reaches of thought. It has been one of the questions from the ancient of times: What is sacred? What is that which has no time, that which is incorruptible, that which is nameless, that which has no quality, no limitation, the timeless which is eternal? Is there such a thing? Man has asked this thousands and thousands of years ago. He has worshipped the sun, earth, nature, the trees, the birds, everything that is living on this earth. Man has worshipped from the ancient times. If you have heard of the Vedas and Upanishads — they never mentioned gods, they said that which is supreme is not manifested and so on.

So are you asking that question too? Are you asking the question — is there something sacred? Is there something that is not put together by thought as all organised religions are, whether it is Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism and so on. In Buddhism there is no God. Among the Hindus there are about 300,000 gods. It is great fun to have so many, we can play with them all. And there are the gods of books; the god according to the Bible, the god according to the Quran, the Islamic world. I don't know if you have noticed that when religions are based on books, the Bible or the Quran, then you have the fundamentalists, then you have people

who are bigoted, narrow, intolerant because books say so. Have you not noticed all this? This country is having the fundamentalists who want to go back to the book. Don't get angry. Just look at it.

So we are asking what is religion, not only what is religion but what is the religious brain, the religious mind. To enquire into that deeply, not superficially, there must be total freedom, complete freedom, not freedom from one thing or the other but freedom as a whole, *per se*. So we are asking when there is that freedom is it possible, living in this ugly world, to be so free from pain, sorrow, anxiety, loneliness and all the rest of it?

Then you have to find out also what is meditation, contemplation in the English sense and meditation in the Asiatic sense. Probably meditation has been brought into this country by all the yogis, gurus and the superstitious people, the traditional people, and therefore they are mechanical. We have to find out what is meditation. Is meditation a form of entertainment or is it when there is real order in one's life then you ask the question what is meditation? Is it following certain systems, methods: The Zen method, the Buddhist meditation, the Hindu meditation and the latest guru with his meditation? So what is meditation? If it is determined, if it is following a system, a method, practising it day after day, what happens to the human brain? It becomes more and more dull. Have you not noticed this: When you repeat, it may be a wrong note and you repeat like a pianist who repeats and plays a wrong note and he keeps on playing the wrong note all the time.

So meditation is something entirely different. It has nothing to do with the methods, systems, practices and therefore it can never be mechanical. It can never be conscious meditation. Do please understand this. It is like a man consciously wanting money and pursuing money. What is the difference between the two? Consciously you meditate wanting to achieve peace, silence and all that. Therefore they are both the same — the man who pursues money, success, power, and the man who pursues spirituality. Is there meditation which is not determined, practised but that requires enormous attention. That attention is a flame. And that attention is not something that you come to much later, but attention *now* to everything, every word, every gesture, every thought; you pay complete attention not partial attention. If you are listening partially now you are not giving complete attention. When you are completely attentive there is no self, there is no limitation.

The brain now is full of information, cluttered up. There is no space in it and one must have space. There must be space. Space means energy. When there is no space, your energy is very very limited. There is the meditation which is not determined, put into a mould. The brain as it is now is heavily laden with knowledge, power, position, and all the rest of it, everlastingly in conflict and cluttered up; it has no space. And freedom, complete freedom, is to have that limitless space. The brain is extraordinarily capable, it has infinite capacity but we have made it so small and petty. So when there is that space and emptiness, there is therefore immense energy. Energy is passion, love, compassion and intelligence. Then there is that truth which is most holy, most sacred, that which has been sought from time immemorial. That truth does not lie in any temple, in any mosque, in any church. It has no path to it except through one's own understanding of oneself, of studying, learning. Then there is that which is eternal.

GURU OR SAGE KRISHNAMURTI ISN'T, BUT PHILOSOPHER MYSTIQUE REMAINS

Los Angeles Times Sunday, May 19, 1985.

By Allan Parachini

OJAI — The house sits hidden in an orange grove, well back from a narrow country lane that winds up through the citrus country of the Ojai Valley. The structure is modest, simple and architecturally characteristic of ranches hereabouts. It is wood and stone, plain, unpretentious.

Since 1922, it has, for at least part of each year, been the headquarters of a short, slender and now, just-turned 90, frail-looking man once called a messiah who settled here in the belief, popular then, that the dry warmth of the valley could cure his younger brother of tuberculosis. It could not.

Back Almost Every Year

Jiddu Krishnamurti has returned here almost every year in mid — to late winter, staying until the end of May. As he has done so, he has tried to convince people he is not what reporters, commentators and other observers have insisted, anyway, on saying he is : a guru, a sage, a mystic, a swami, a leader, Bhagwan this, Maharishi that, a holy man, someone who would be God.

That he has been denying he is any of these things since he was a teen-ager — and has lived a life apparently consistent with his insistence that he is not a guru — has not been sufficient to deter an ever-skeptical world from insisting regularly that he thinks he is, anyway.

Trappings of Cults

Such titles have the trappings of cults — “isms,” as Krishnamurti likes to call them. He contends that cults — which he says range

from individual groups of religious extremists to the broader Christian and non-Christian religious right — represent the disturbing harvest of people trying to follow some leader when, in fact, truth can only be found by oneself, in oneself.

That his denials have so largely fallen on deaf ears has been interpreted by some as confirmation of one of Krishnamurti's most salient points: that the world so thirsts for God figures that it will do almost anything to conjure one up. Faith has no value to Krishnamurti. Faith, as he sees it, is an abdication of personal responsibility.

In the years after he was, as a boy of 9, identified as a messiah, Krishnamurti led a cult, the Order of the Star, but he disbanded it in 1929 and liquidated all of its assets. It had taken a year of deliberation he recalled to make the decision final. But in the end, he disbanded the order because he had decided a central tenet of his value system was that "I said, 'Don't follow authority.'" And, since to lead a cult was to be an authority figure, the order had to go.

Since then, a central component of Krishnamurti's message has been a warning about how dangerous cults can be and how much more prevalent they are still likely to become.

If Krishnamurti knows nothing else, he knows perseverance; and in a small, shy, quiet voice that reflects a mind still keen, he will speak this weekend, as he did last, in a stately oak grove on the other side of town from the citrus ranch, delivering essentially the same message in precisely the same place as he has for about 70 years. Last Saturday's and Sunday's lectures drew about 2,000 people each. This weekend's addresses begin at 11.30 a.m. each day.

In many ways, Krishnamurti's is a starkly simple philosophy: that the existing world order, in which human behaviour is based on a system of faith in something or another — regulated by reward and punishment — is wrong and that such concepts as nationalism and the supremacy of one religion over another ought to be foreign to it. He does not offer — and he has never offered, his writings through the decades confirm — himself as a leader for the system he advocates.

When Krishnamurti speaks in public, he scrupulously avoids referring to himself in the first person, preferring "the speaker," instead. Last Sunday, sitting on a simple folding chair on a low, unadorned platform under a spreading oak, he repeatedly cautioned

his audience against perceiving him as an oracle and themselves as the people honoring the sage and awaiting his commands.

'Be Skeptical'

"Be skeptical of what the speaker is saying, especially," Krishnamurti told them. "He is not a guru. He doesn't want a thing from you not even your applause. Please be sure of that, so you can relax. Please listen not to the speaker, but to yourself.

"The speaker, he is not important at all. But what is being said (and discussed) is important. Please don't wait for the speaker to tell you what to do, which would be another form of the cultivation of guilt."

But even Krishnamurti recognizes how much he is asking of his adherents when he demands that they not perceive themselves as followers. At 90, he retains a quick, self-effacing wit. Trying to introduce a point he had made in a recent address at the United Nations, for instance, he told the crowd "the speaker doesn't know why he was invited, but he went. He's not telling you this out of vanity. He's informing you."

Then, having posed a broad question — "What is thought? What is thinking?" — Krishnamurti paused for a moment and asked, "Do you want my explanation?" The crowd, of course, murmured assent. Krishnamurti chuckled. "That is what I am objecting to," he said in jocular reproach. "(The speaker) becomes the nasty guru; and you become the followers." Laughter rose from the audience; the speaker had struck again.

He objects to having his opinions called a philosophy, though the language probably fails as a resource for otherwise describing it. Philosophy, you see, he explained in a racy interview at the little ranch house, has grown to consist of the study of the writings and teachings of others. He says that since he has never read widely in philosophy or theology — studying only the old Testament, and that to appreciate the rhythm and flow of the King James English more than the nature of the theology it contains — he isn't a philosopher, at least in the conventional sense. Instead, he says simply he is offering "facts" — a characterization woven throughout his writings and teachings of the last seven decades — that a listener is free to disregard.

Philosophers, he says, a twinkle coming to his eyes, "talk or write about something that other people have taught. Aristotle will lay

down certain principles and the Aristotelian people talk about what he said. You understand, they talk about talks and write about what has been written. So I am not a philosopher."

He has delivered this message in such places as India, England and Switzerland. This year, it was Washington, where two addresses at the Kennedy Center were sold out, and at the U.N. In March of 1984, he said the same things to scientists at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. Two years before, in "The Network of Thought," an anthology of addresses he gave in 1981 in Switzerland, Krishnamurti first likened the drift of contemporary education and thought to the simple programming of computers.

"We are educated wrongly," he said, sitting in the ranch house. "I have spoken at some of the universities in this country and we are programmed. We're conditioned. And of course (being conditioned) religiously is the easiest.

"The brain is becoming narrower and narrower. I don't know if you have observed this. We are never educated inwardly. Do you understand? So there is no holistic education. That is education of the whole human being. Only partially."

And yet to the Los Alamos scientists, Krishnamurti could offer little solace, for his is a system of beliefs in which being a leader or having followers is simply wrong. There can be no moral initiative but the purest form that comes from within an individual. It is a demanding system — one even Krishnamurti realizes is far more difficult to apply in practice than in the abstract.

Even the Oak Grove School, founded by Krishnamurti here 10 years ago, has a problem with it. For a time, the school operated without giving grades. But a few years ago, when it expanded from elementary grades to include the high school level, Oak Grove gave in to the expectations of colleges and began offering transcripts with grades attached, David Moody, Oak Grove's educational director, said.

And if students fight, Oak Grove insists it does not use punishment, but it does not rule out expulsion as a last resort. Isn't expulsion a form of punishment and aren't good grades a form of reward? Moody chuckled. "You're getting to the heart of controversies of that have swirled around this school for years," he said.

Krishnamurti's is a set of beliefs that requires at once both everything and nothing from its adherents. Everything in the sense that to agree

with Krishnamurti is to agree that there can be no leaders and no followers, no tenets on which to fall back, and no honour in the defense that one was simply following orders.

"I was asked this question by the scientists at Los Alamos," he said. "What would you do if you were director of this (laboratory)? Taking into account you are responsible for the safety and security of the country, what would you do?"

"I said, probably exactly what you are doing. Thank God. I'm not in your place."

"But one has to go very deeply into the (true) question, which is: 'Why have we done these things (developed nuclear bombs) in the first place?'"

Yet his message is perceived almost as just the opposite, even by some of the people who were laying down blankets on the fresh green grass in the oak grove to listen to him obviously not for the first time. There was a minority view clearly discernible in the audience that Krishnamurti's philosophy is attractive because it requires no action outside the individual. One middle-aged man who obviously was the veteran of many Krishnamurti talks was attempting to explain the philosophy to a young friend. It wasn't clear whether Krishnamurti would agree with the man's description of the Krishnamurti message.

"That's why he (Krishnamurti) is so popular," the middle-aged man said. "You don't have to do anything. You just have to be aware."

Sitting, wearing blue jeans, an open-collar, brown-striped cotton sport shirt, button-up dark-blue sweater and sandals over his socks, in a spare den at the citrus ranch house here, Krishnamurti would not be taken by a casual visitor for 90. A likely guess would be 70 or 75. He does not wear glasses and has both the gait and gaze of a man 20 or perhaps 25 years younger than he is.

Krishnamurti was born near Madras, India, on May 12, 1895 — 10 days earlier than the date erroneously listed in a variety of published biographical sketches, according to Mary Zimbalist, the stately older woman who is a friend and associate (he eschews the

terms disciples, believers or followers). As a trustee of the Krishnamurti Foundation of America, the tiny organization that functions as the only American corporate structure (there are separate foundations in India and England) supporting him, she accompanies him in his travels.

He spends roughly four months each year in India; four in England and Europe, and four in Ojai. His time is divided between supervision of schools he has founded on three continents (five schools in India, one in England and the 82-student Oak Grove School here, which came to being in 1975); public speaking, and contemplation.

Except for four years during World War II, which broke out while he was here and resulted in his spending the war in residence on the citrus ranch, Krishnamurti has adhered to this schedule annually with only infrequent variation, Zimbalist said.

Though he is philosophically an ardent anti-Communist, Krishnamurti avoids political entanglements. His reading habits as he describes them are eclectic. He still studies the Old Testament, but most of his other reading, he said, is of thrillers and detective novels. Lately, he said, he has been captivated by the best seller "Breaking With Moscow," by the Russian defector Arkady Shevchenko.

Krishnamurti's mother died when he was quite young, but his father was a passionate follower of an American cultist, Annie Besant, head of the Theosophical Society, whose philosophy was a mix of Buddhism and Indian Brahmanism. It was as prominent a cult in its time as any of today's sects or fascinations. At the height of the Victorian Age, Besant, Krishnamurti recalled, advocated such controversial concepts as birth control and divorce.

When Krishnamurti was very young, he recalled, Besant was searching for a boy who would become anointed as a great teacher, and express the word of God direct. After considering a few others, Besant chose young Krishnamurti as the chosen one, adopting him as a foster son so he could begin to be trained for his calling. Newspapers of the day quickly called it a declaration of the new messiah, but Krishnamurti says the analogy distorted Besant's expectations.

"It was a deep conviction for Mrs. Besant that there would be a great teacher coming ... that there is in the world the concept called bodhisattva (a particularly enlightened being) and he would

manifest," Krishnamurti recalled. "So they were looking around for a human being ... for a boy ... and when I came on the scene, they said, 'This is the boy we've been looking for'. I was probably 9 or 10.

Dr. Besant said, "The world teacher is coming". And of course, the newspapers said (she said I was the) Messiah. I'm trying to put it in words that you will understand and I don't want to hide anything. I've had various experiences of a special kind, but I don't cling to them. It's water under the bridge."

Whatever he was supposed to be, the youngster was venerated by Besant and, through his teen years, Krishnamurti travelled his teen years widely and enjoyed celebrity status as he matured. Besant also had adopted Krishnamurti's younger brother, Nityananda, and when the two boys were in their teens, the younger one contracted tuberculosis — Krishnamurti has always believed it was from swimming in infected waters in Lake Geneva in Switzerland. In India, someone told them that Ojai in California offered the chance of a cure — the theory of the day being that TB could be treated by exposure to dry, clean air.

First Visit in 1922

In 1922, the two young men made their first visit here. Nityananda grew worse, however, and died in 1925 at the age of 28.

But the grooming of Krishnamurti continued unabated. Besant established the Order of the Star to serve as the conduit for the teachings of the bodhisattva, or Messiah or whatever she thought Krishnamurti was. He became a darling of the media, and his comings and goings — in luxury aboard the most noted ocean liners of the day — were regularly chronicled. A strikingly handsome young man, he was rumored and reported to have had romantic involvements all over the world — all of which he denied. Reporters swarmed around him, demanding his opinions on baseball, flappers, jazz and fast cars.

As the 1920s progressed, Krishnamurti began holding camp meetings at the end of May every year, speaking in Ojai in the same oak grove where his annual talks are held now.

Sometime in 1928, however, young Krishnamurti, then 33, realized that something about the adulation bothered him. He had concluded, he recalled, that the premise of his own near deity "was wrong."

For the next year, he said, he sought advice of world leaders and trusted friends, all of whom, he said, urged him to retain the Order of the Star as a vehicle. There were properties and wealth all over the world, but in 1929, Krishnamurti announced to a startled Besant and his own followers that the Order of the Star was dissolved and all its holdings were to be divested. "At the end of some time," Krishnamurti recalled, "I said, 'All right, I'm going to decide this,' and I said, 'Dissolve the whole thing.' It had gradually become ugly. And I've been doing this (travelling, denying his own deity and talking) ever since.

"This is true, all this. It's a fact. It's like you're sitting there. I'm sitting here."

"And we don't want facts. We want some quick theological theories."

"If I promised reward, I would have quantities of money ... great estates. You understand? At one time, I used to have all that when I was quite young. I said it's all wrong."

Krishnamurti invariably faces questions about religious fads and their contemporary manifestations. It is easy, he responds, to allow the heat of the modern moment to make it appear that cultism or religious fanaticism is a new problem.

Sitting in the white-painted den, Krishnamurti, as he often does, met one of the first of an interviewer's questions about cults allegorically, a technique he has been known for throughout his public life.

"I have a friend who is a very serious journalist in Europe," he said. "And a friend of his one morning said, 'I'm leaving everything and going off to Oregon'." The destination : Rajneeshpuram, the controversial headquarters of the cult and led by the self-described mystic Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh.

"And my friend asked him why," Krishnamurti continued. "He (the friend's friend) said. 'Here, there is no hope.' A while later, the friend wrote back saying, 'You know, I feel entirely free ... free because I am totally irresponsible. 'And you know what I am doing? I am pulling out old nails from old wood'."

Krishnamurti paused for a moment for the anecdotes to have the calculated effect. "You understand, sir," he said finally to his visitor, "this is what is happening in the world."

"The gurus come along with their beards, whether in the name of the savior or the priest or the Indian gurus with their nonsense, and people flock to them. The gurus say, 'I know. I'll tell you all about it.' And the person who hears that is so gullible, hoping the guru will give him something. And behind it, there is a lot of money and lot of power. And to protect that power and money, they (some cults) have guns.

"This is happening in the name of God."

Several Meanings

"The word guru in Sanskrit, the root of it means weight. And it has several meanings, but it also means one who removes ignorance, not imposes it, as is done now. It has been traditional in India for many centuries, the idea of somebody leading you to something, and in India many of the gurus have made enormous amounts of money, because people want to do."

He contends today that at no time has the problem of cults and "isms" been more critical than it is now. It has become a worldwide affliction, spurred, Krishnamurti contends, by a complex of modern-day social problems, ranging from the persistent spectre of nuclear annihilation to social problems and the inexorable threat of a growing world population.

At the same time, Krishnamurti bristles at the philosophy of much of the anti-nuclear war movement because, he said, "they want a particular type of war to stop, but not war itself. Why? It's because of nationalism or some other kind of separation."

In that context, according to Krishnamurti, all religious extremism can be viewed as part of single process.

"We begin in the East. In India, there is a population of over 800 million people, and it increases by the population of England and Australia combined every year. There is enormous uncertainty, insecurity, poverty, and this is propelling them to gods," Krishnamurti said. "Then you come to the West, including Europe, and something of the same phenomenon is going on. The threat of war. And in this country, too, there is uncertainty.

KRISHNAJI AT OJAI

Question : The whole world of nature is a competition of survival. Is it not innate in human nature to struggle for the same reason? Are we not struggling against our basic nature in seeking change?

Krishnaji : The question is, nature struggles to achieve light in a forest, for example, and it is a struggle. The stronger kills the weaker in nature. The tiger kills the deer, the lion kills some other thing and it is part of nature. The questioner says if it is part of nature, why should we change at all because it is intrinsic. Why do we say it is intrinsic to our nature? Why do we say there it is alright, it is part of us, part of our existence? Intrinsicity is then part of us. But if it is so that it is intrinsic in us, which one questions, then I cannot change anything. But why should we accept that it is innate in us? Is it my indolence, to leave it all alone? Is it my sense of exhaustion? Or are we supposed to be as human beings, a little more intelligent, a little more reasonable, a little more sane and we are supposed to use our sanity, our intelligence, our experience, to live differently? Perhaps that difference may be total and not just remain as a mediocre person which is now being encouraged through education and all the rest of it. So is it mediocrity that is fighting us, that we hold on to and say we are slowly moving towards the precipice? Or do we begin to question the whole process of our existence using common sense, logic, reason, awareness? And one questions intuition: it is rather doubtful, it may be wish fulfilment and calling it intuition. One has to be logical about all this.

Question : Why is it that mankind universally has sought what is called god? Is it only out of fear and need for security or is there an essential religious instinct in all human beings?

Krishnaji : What do you think? What is your response to that question? Is it fear? Is it the desire for security? Is it the desire to be ultimately rewarded? Is it desire for comfort? Is it we are so discontented with everything about us that we want something to gain? Religions have said god has made man, in different words. Obviously he seems to be an extraordinary, strange god. And has man made god? If god has made us, something has gone wrong. Please sirs, this is very serious. What is it that is making man, human beings, seek something called god? So the question is not whether there is god or not but why do human beings live with illusions, images, symbols, Why? If you look at yourself you will see you have lots of images, images about yourself, the image about your wife and your children if you are a parent, or you have images about politicians, religious people. You have accumulated images which are illusions. If I create an image about my wife, that image has been built through 15 years or 10 years or one day. What takes place in our relationship? The image becomes far more important than the fact. So I impose this image on my wife or my husband and this image then becomes far more potential than the wife, the actuality. So this image or images support us. She is fulfilling her ambition, her position in the society, tremendous womens' activity and the men's activity. So these images and the pursuit and fulfilment of their images are separating us. This is a common fact. Then the brain says why should I create these images? What is the reason for it? None at all. Your wife is what she is and I as a man I am what I am. From there you can start. Then you can do something. You can break the images and say let us face things as they are. You want to possess and I don't want to be possessed. You like to be possessed and I say don't cling. We begin to quarrel because I have an image of myself which is I don't want to be clung to. So it all goes on. The real question is whether one can live without a single illusion. That is real freedom, that means you are facing facts all the time, not try to change the facts. That takes place when you just watch a fact.

Question : What is the primary basic obstacle which prevents observation and insight?

Krishnaji : We have talked about observation just now. So we went go into it again. What is insight? People have talked about it — to have an insight into things. That is, having perception into not only illusions, images, but facts. How do you have an insight into things? Let us take an example — that all religious organisations are

merely an activity of conditioning, of fear, whether it is Christianity or Hinduism. What does insight mean? Insight implies not having the continuity of memory which is the past, but the ending of it and seeing something new. If I am being programmed as a Catholic, Hindu, Presbyterian, a Democrat or a Republican, god knows what else, if I have been conditioned, and that conditioning is always active, I cannot have an insight. I may have the capacity to invent. Invention is based on knowledge. Creation is not. I won't go into it as it is a totally different subject. Creation is not something continuous, it is not something in the end.

So to have an insight into things there must be freedom from memory, from conditioning. The brain that is programmed, as ours are, cannot have an insight. Scientists may have partial insights because their inventions bring about other results, harmful, beneficial and all the rest of it. But total insight is to be free of conditioning of the brain and that total freedom gives you a complete, holistic, insight.

Question : What is the responsibility to ourselves and to others?

Krishnaji : Let us look at the question. What do you mean by responsibility? The word responsibility, it means to respond. It comes from the word respond. Respond means it is retrospective. Look at it carefully. We are just looking, investigating the word responsibility. I have a responsibility towards my wife. I respond to her in a certain way which I don't do to others. I respond according to my background to her background. If that response is retrospective, i.e. looking back, that is, she is my wife, I have learnt about her and that learning is memory. So the word responsibility implies memory, recognition. Recognition is part of memory and that is the responsibility towards her and the responsibility in our relationship — sexual, sensational and so on, producing a baby and together we are responsible for the baby, responsible for its superficial education, school, college and university if I have some money or half way and so on. Up to a certain age we are responsible for them. Afterwards they can go and in old age they throw me out, send me to Florida or somewhere else or to oldage homes. You know what is happening in this country, the tragedy of it all.

In India there is no social security. I was told yesterday that the most populated country in the world is India. It is one third the size of America and its population is growing over a rate of fifty million a year. There are over eight hundred million people there. There

is no social security. They must have children, especially boys, because as they grow old the son will look after them. That is the idea of having 3 or 4 children, and as the boys grow older, get a job, this has been one of their burdens — look after their parents, educate their brothers and sisters. And I know several boys who have committed suicide; they cannot manage it any more. They feel responsible for their parents. Please understand the tragedy of all this.

So the word responsibility is very complex. Are we responsible to ourselves? That is the question. What is the responsibility to ourselves and to others? Are we responsible to ourselves? Who is me? Who is I? Am I responsible to myself which means the division : there is a person who is responsible to myself. Am I responsible to my wife? There is somebody inside me or outside me who is responsible to me. This sounds rather silly, does it not? Or is there such a person who is responsible — god, Brezhnev, the glorified Father in Heaven? Do you see how our brain works? When I say responsible to myself, I have divided myself into some entity who is responsible to me. Therefore I am responsible to that entity which I have separated carefully, which is myself. That is, the thinker is the thought. Without thought there is no thinker but we have divided the thinker and the thought — I must control my thought, i.e. a bad thought, and I must think rightly which means I am different from thought. So the thinker is the thought. There is no separation. The observer is the observed. There is no experience without the experiencer. Experiencer is the experienced.

Then what is the responsibility to others? What is my responsibility to you and what is your responsibility to me? There is the audience. What is your responsibility to me and what am I responsible to you? Sir, look at it. I am just looking at it for the first time and all this comes out because I really want to see am I responsible to you and are you responsible to me and if I say I am not responsible to you then I am isolating myself; and if you say to me we are not responsible to you, then you put me aside. I wonder if you see this. Responsibility implies division. I am responsible to her and she is responsible to me. I am responsible to you and you are responsible to me. That means I have separated myself from my wife, I have separated from you and you have separated yourself from me, and so we quarrel. I don't understand you and we don't understand you. It is the same thing, which is I am the Arab and you are Israeli; if you don't like it, I am the Israeli and you the Arab. I am a Muslim

and you are Hindu or I am the Hindu and you are the Muslim. It is my country and I am going to protect it and you are going to protect your country and we are going to war. It is your ideology and you are going to be responsible for that and I have my ideology and I am going to be responsible for that. Right? This is what is happening in the world, calling it 'responsibility', especially the elite. The elite say we are responsible for the people. It is all such rot to me personally, because we are one human beings. You go through all the travails. So does the other human being psychologically. They have shed tears in India, in Europe, and you have shed tears here. Tears are common to all of us, like laughter. You have destroyed the whole Red Indian culture, wiped them out, that is your holocaust. Let us all face it and this has been going on from the beginning of time. And responsibility implies duty — I must do this, this is my country, duty to my ideal. Sir, look at all this. Is it possible to live without division, is it possible to live with my wife if I have a wife without any sense of division between her and me? Not common ambition; if it is common ambition then it is again a division. If it is each one of us fulfilling ourselves, again it is a division. I wonder if you see all this.

So is it possible to live without a single nationality, without being identified with any country? It is our earth and your earth and my earth. Is it possible to live without any identification with my religion? Think it out sirs. Don't just agree or disagree. Is it possible not to be identified with any group, any organisation, any institution, which does not mean you are the withdrawing from the world, isolating from the world. On the contrary. Because, then you are the entire humanity not just an idea of it but the religious feeling of it that you are the entire humanity. I am my brother's keeper, not that it means I am going to interfere with the poor chap, tell him what to do.

So, sir If I may ask, what is it that you have received from all this? I am asking this most respectfully and humbly. After listening to the facts, after listening to all this, what has one captured, received, not helped but seen for oneself?

May 16, 1985 — Ojai, California.

CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

	Rs. P.
The First and Last Freedom (Hard cover)	114.00
Commentaries on Living	18.00
Commentaries on Living II Series	18.00
Commentaries on Living III Series	20.00
Freedom from the Known	9.00
The Only Revolution (Hard cover)	114.00
The Urgency of Change (Hard Cover)	102.00
The Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	61.00
The Second Penguin Krishnamurti Reader	61.00
The Flight of the Eagle	25.00
You are the World	20.00
The Impossible Question (Penguin paperback)	48.00
Beyond Violence	12.00
The Awakening of Intelligence (Hard cover)	146.00
Tradition and Revolution	25.00
Krishnamurti's Notebook	25.00
The Wholeness of Life	24.00
Truth and Actuality (Hard cover)	60.00
Exploration into Insight	20.00
Meditations (Hard cover)	30.00
Poems and Parables (Hard cover)	60.00
Krishnamurti's Journal (Hard cover)	60.00
The Network of Thought	75.00
Questions and Answers	45.00
Mind Without Measure	25.00
Inward Flowering	3.00
A Dialogue with Oneself	2.00
Core of the Teachings	1.00

Books on Education

Education and the Significance of Life	10.00
This Matter of Culture (Hard cover)	114.00
Life Ahead (Hard cover)	35.00
Krishnamurti on Education	25.00
Beginnings of Learning (Penguin paperback)	52.00
Letters to the Schools	16.00

Books on Krishnamurti

Within the Mind	40.00
The Seer Who Walks Alone	1.00

Annual subscription Rs. 22 or \$ 8 or £ 6. Life membership Rs. 250.

Cover Design : Kiran Khalap